plots by paired plot design experiments (except herbs vs. woody which was a completely randomized design) on square root  $(\sqrt{x+0.5})$  transformed data (no./m<sup>2</sup>) Results Experiments m<sup>2</sup> plot Standard Standard Mean Corrected Corrected Mean no./m<sup>2</sup> no./m² Significance replications deviation deviation mean mean 1971 1972 1971 1972 1971 1972 Herbs  $t_{6,dt} = 2.445$ ; significant 7 5.5 2.8 at 0.1 controls 7.7 4.1 8.6 6.6 treated 19.9 29.0 9.7 34.3 4.6 28.5 Impatiens capensis modified  $t_{6 \text{ df}} = 1.462$ ; 7 controls 1.9 0.7 0.4 not significant at 0.1 1.1 0.6 0.4 treated 1.3 2.3 0.7 1.9 0.5 1.4  $t_{6 dt} = 0.954$ ; not Other herbs

TABLE 33. Comparison of herbaceous and woody plants in flood-plain H. helix weeded (treated) and unweeded (control) 1 × 1-m

controls	7	4.3	7.7	2.6	5.6	1.7	3.5	significant at 0.1
treated	7	10.5	17.6	5.6	10.1	2.8	6.2	
Woody								$t_{7 \text{ df}} = 0.775;$
controls	8	3.1	5.8	1.8	3.9	1.1	2.4	not significant at 0.1
treated	8	2.1	6.6	1.0	5.1	0.6	3.5	
Herbs vs.	7	_		_	_	_	_	$t_{13 \text{ df}} = 1.643$ ; not

0.2

0.1

0.5

0.4

0.6

1.9

2.5

2.2

0.2

0.1

0.3

0.3

0.5

1.1

1.5

1.6

modified  $t_{7 df} = 0.885$ ;

not significant at 0.1

not significant at 0.1

 $t_{7,df} = 0.072$ ;

controls	8	3.1	5.8	1.8	3.9	1.1	2.4	not significant at
treated	8	2.1	6.6	1.0	5.1	0.6	3.5	
Herbs vs.	7	_	_	_	_	_	_	$t_{13 \text{ df}} = 1.643$ ; not
woody	8	_	_	<del></del>	_	_	_	significant at 0.1
Trees								modified $t_{7.47} = 0$

0.9

3.6

4.3

2.9

controls

Other woody

controls

treated

treated

8

8

8

8

0.5

0.4

1.4

0.7